

1 Gregg F. LoCascio, P.C. (*pro hac vice*)
2 gregg.locascio@kirkland.com
3 Sean M. McEldowney (S.B.N. 248368)
4 sean.mceldowney@kirkland.com
5 Christopher Nalevanko (*pro hac vice*)
6 christopher.nalevanko@kirkland.com
7 Brian N. Gross (*pro hac vice*)
8 brian.gross@kirkland.com
9 Kirkland & Ellis LLP
10 655 Fifteenth St., N.W.
11 Washington, D.C. 20005
12 Telephone: (202) 879-5000
13 Facsimile: (202) 879-5200

14 Luke L. Dauchot (S.B.N. 229829)
15 luke.dauchot@kirkland.com
16 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
17 333 South Hope Street
18 Los Angeles, California 90071
19 Telephone: (213) 680-8400
20 Facsimile: (213) 680-8500

21 Attorneys for Defendant
22 SIEMENS MEDICAL SOLUTIONS USA, INC.

23 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
24 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

25 NEUROGRAFIX, a California corporation; } CASE NO. CV 10-1990 MRP(RZX)
26 WASHINGTON RESEARCH }
27 FOUNDATION, a not-for-profit Washington }
28 corporation,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

SIEMENS MEDICAL SOLUTIONS USA,
INC., a Delaware corporation; and
SIEMENS AKTIENGESELLSCHAFT, a
German corporation,

Defendants.

**MEMORANDUM IN
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION OF THE
COURT'S CLAIM
CONSTRUCTION**

**The Hon. Mariana R. Pfaelzer
United States District Court Judge**

**Hearing date: October 5, 2011
Time: 11:00 a.m.
Location: Courtroom 12**

1 SIEMENS MEDICAL SOLUTIONS USA, }
2 INC., }
3 Counterclaim Plaintiff, }
4 vs. }
5 NEUROGRAFIX, and WASHINGTON }
6 RESEARCH FOUNDATION, }
7 Counterclaim Defendants. }

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3	I.	BACKGROUND.....	2
4	A.	Applicable Law Regarding 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶6.....	2
5	B.	Background on Proceedings Regarding Claims 36, 39, 46, and 49.....	3
6	II.	ARGUMENT.....	4
7	A.	Plaintiffs' Motion Should Be Denied Because It Does Not Even 8 Purport to Identify Any Permissible Ground for Reconsideration 9 Under Local Rule 7-18.....	5
10	B.	Plaintiffs' Motion Should Be Denied Because It Repeats 11 Arguments that Plaintiffs Already Raised and the Court Correctly 12 Rejected.....	7
13	1.	The Court Correctly Rejected Plaintiffs' Fundamental 14 Argument that the Claim Language at Issue Sufficiently 15 Discloses an "Act."	8
16	2.	The Court Was Correct During Claim Construction to Reject 17 the Points that Plaintiffs Rehash in Their Motion.	11
18	III.	CONCLUSION.....	16

1 **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**
2

3 **Cases**

389 <i>Orange Street Partners v. Arnold</i> , 179 F.3d 656 (9th Cir. 1999)	5
4 <i>A.A. v. Orange Cnty. Health Care Agency</i> , 5 2011 WL 86935 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 3, 2011).....	7
6 <i>Activision Publ'g, Inc. v. Gibson Guitar Corp.</i> , 7 2009 WL 586629 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 26, 2009)	7
8 <i>Advanced Med. Optics, Inc. v. Alcon Inc.</i> , 9 361 F. Supp. 2d 370 (D. Del. 2005).....	16
9 <i>Agere Sys. Inc. v. Atmel Corp.</i> , 10 2003 WL 21652264 (E.D. Pa. May 27, 2003).....	9, 10, 15
10 <i>Aventis Pharms. S.A. v. Amphastar Pharms., Inc.</i> , 11 2005 WL 5957795 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 25, 2005).....	7
12 <i>Brown v. United States</i> , 13 2011 WL 333380 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 31, 2011)	7
14 <i>Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc., v. St. Jude Med., Inc.</i> , 15 381 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	16
16 <i>Carroll v. Nakatani</i> , 17 342 F.3d 934 (9th Cir. 2003)	5
18 <i>Carter v. Variflex, Inc.</i> , 19 2000 WL 35789500 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 18, 2000)	7
20 <i>Caterpillar Inc. v. Detroit Diesel Corp.</i> , 21 961 F. Supp. 1249 (N.D. Ind. 1996), <i>aff'd</i> , 194 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	9, 10
22 <i>Davidson v. City of Culver City</i> , 23 2004 WL 5361891 (C.D. Cal. 2004), 24 <i>aff'd</i> , 159 Fed. App'x 756 (9th Cir. 2005).....	8
25 <i>In re Cohn</i> , 26 438 F.2d 989 (C.C.P.A. 1971)	16
27 <i>Inventio AG v. Thyssenkrupp Elevator Ams. Corp.</i> , 28 2011 WL 2342744 (Fed. Cir. June 15, 2011).....	16
29 <i>j2 Global Commn's Inc. v. Captaris Inc.</i> , 30 2011 WL 2882792 (C.D. Cal. July 19, 2011).....	6
31 <i>Kinetics Noise Control, Inc. v. Ecore Int'l, Inc.</i> , 32 2011 WL 940335 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 14, 2011).....	7
33 <i>Kona Enters., Inc. v. Bishop</i> , 34 229 F.3d 877 (9th Cir. 2000)	5

1	<i>MAI Sys. Corp. v. Walbert Enters., Inc.</i> , 116 F.3d 485 (9th Cir. 1997)	8
2	<i>Martinis v. Barbanell</i> , 211 F.3d 1274 (9th Cir. 2000)	8
3	<i>Masco Corp. v. United States</i> , 303 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	2, 12, 15
4	<i>Mas-Hamilton Group v. LaGard, Inc.</i> , 156 F.3d 1206 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	11, 12
5	<i>McCoy v. Roe</i> , 234 Fed. App'x 559 (9th Cir. 2009)	7
6	<i>O.I. Corp. v. Tekmar Co.</i> , 115 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	2, 3, 9, 10
7	<i>Raytheon Co. v. Roper Corp.</i> , 724 F.2d 951 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	12
8	<i>Seal-Flex, Inc. v. Athletic Track & Court Contr.</i> , 172 F.3d 836 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	2, 9, 10, 12
9	<i>Selectron Indus., Inc. v. Selectron Int'l</i> , 2007 WL 5193735 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2007)	6
10	<i>Spacey v. Burgar</i> , 207 F. Supp. 2d 1037 (C.D. Cal. 2001)	7
11	<i>Synopsys, Inc v. Magma Design Automation, Inc.</i> , 2005 WL 6227071 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 23, 2005)	16
12	<i>Townsend v. Chase Bank USA, N.A.</i> , 2009 WL 764513 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 20, 2009)	6
13	<i>Weber v. Gorenfeld</i> , 8 F.3d 34 (9th Cir. 1993)	8
14	<i>Welker Bearing Co. v. PHD, Inc.</i> , 550 F.3d 1090 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	12
15	<i>Yang Ming Marine Transp. Corp. v. Oceanbridge Shipping Int'l, Inc.</i> , 48 F. Supp. 2d 1049 (C.D. Cal. 1999)	7
16	Statutes	
17	35 U.S.C. §112, ¶6	passim
18	Rules	
19	C.D. Cal. L.R. 7-18.	5, 7
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

EXHIBIT LIST

The following exhibits cited herein refer to the exhibits to the September 12, 2011 Declaration of Sean M. McEldowney In Support of Siemens' Memorandum in Opposition of Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration, filed concurrently herewith.

Exhibit OMR1: Excerpts from the *Markman* Hearing, dated March 24, 2011

Exhibit OMR2: Email from Sean M. McEldowney to Andrew D. Weiss, dated September 6, 2011

Exhibit OMR3: Email from Andrew D. Weiss to Sean M. McEldowney, dated September 7, 2011

Exhibit OMR4: Excerpts from the telephonic status conference with the Court, dated May 26, 2011

1 After unsuccessfully arguing their proposed constructions for the “step-
2 plus-function” limitations in claims 36, 39, 46, and 49 of the ‘360 patent, Plaintiffs
3 now want this Court to “revisit” the very same arguments based on the very same law
4 and facts that Plaintiffs offered during claim construction. By doing so, Plaintiffs’
5 reconsideration motion does precisely what Local Rule 7-18 expressly prohibits.
6 Plaintiffs do not even bother to argue in their brief that their motion satisfies any of
7 the three limited bases for seeking reconsideration under the local rule. Instead,
8 Plaintiffs flatly violate this Court’s Local Rules by repeating (verbatim in several
9 instances) the same arguments they made before that were rejected during claim
10 construction.

11 Plaintiffs had a full opportunity during claim construction to address
12 whether the “step-plus-function” provision of 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶6 applies to claims 36,
13 39, 46, and 49—Plaintiffs submitted two briefs totaling 60 pages, conducted expert
14 discovery and submitted expert declarations, and argued their points at a four-hour
15 *Markman* hearing. After considering all of the arguments, the Court correctly rejected
16 Plaintiffs’ arguments the first time around, and the Court need not and should not
17 “revisit” Plaintiffs’ same flawed arguments.

18 Plaintiffs’ argument in their motion for reconsideration boils down to the
19 same assertion they made during claim construction: that the “processing” step in
20 claim 36 and the “analyzing” step in claims 39, 46, and 49 avoid step-plus-function
21 treatment under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶6 because, according to Plaintiffs, the claims
22 sufficiently describe the “acts” required to accomplish the complex, computer-
23 implemented functions recited in those claims simply by using the words “processing”
24 and “analyzing.” (*Compare* D.I. 128-1 at 2 (arguing that “[b]ecause claim 36, 39, 46,
25 and 49 recite the acts of” “processing” and “analyzing” “NeuroGrafix respectfully
26 requests that the Court reconsider its Claim Construction Order”), *with* D.I. 103 at 34-
27 35 (arguing that the claims are not subject to 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶6 because claim 36
28

1 “recites the act of ‘processing’” and claims 39, 46, and 49 “discloses the acts of
2 analyzing.”) That argument failed last time (and must fail again) because it is
3 contrary to Federal Circuit law. The test for whether a claim describes an “act,” rather
4 than merely a “generic description” of the step, is whether it describes “how the
5 function is accomplished” or “implemented” in the claims. *O.I. Corp. v. Tekmar Co.*,
6 115 F.3d 1576, 1582-83 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Seal-Flex, Inc. v. Athletic Track & Court*
7 *Contr.*, 172 F.3d 836, 849-50 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (Rader, J., concurring). The claim
8 language at issue here is devoid of anything describing how to accomplish the claimed
9 steps, and the Court therefore correctly rejected Plaintiffs’ contention, explaining that
10 “because the claim term **does not describe how** to process the data [or analyze the
11 data], it does not have the requisite act and is thus a step-plus-function claim.”¹ (D.I.
12 114 at 27, 5 (citing *Seal-Flex*)). Thus, even if the Court were to revisit the
13 applicability of §112, ¶6 for claims 36, 39, 46, and 49, which it need not and should
14 not do, the Court’s claim construction would be the same.

15 **I. BACKGROUND**

16 More than three months after the Court’s claim construction order, and
17 only in response to Siemens’ motion for summary judgment of invalidity in light of
18 the Court’s claim construction order (D.I. 119-1 at 15-17), Plaintiffs’ motion for
19 reconsideration asks the Court to revisit its holding that method claims 36, 39, 46, and
20 49 are “step-plus-function” claims pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶6. (See D.I. 106 at 6-
21 7, 21-22, 32-34; D.I. 108 at 12-15, 22-25 (claim construction briefing discussing
22 applicable law and addressing method claims 36, 39, 46, and 49).)

23 **A. Applicable Law Regarding 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶6.**

24 As explained during claim construction, 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶6 applies to
25 method claims that recite “steps plus function without *acts*.” *Masco Corp. v. United*
26 *States*, 303 F.3d 1316, 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Whereas “steps” for purposes of §112,
27

28 ¹ All emphasis added unless otherwise noted.

¶6 are merely a “generic description of elements of a process,” “acts” for this section refer to “implementation of such steps,” i.e., “how the function is accomplished.” *O.I. Corp.*, 115 F.3d at 1582-83 (“We interpret the term ‘steps’ [in §112, ¶6] to refer to the generic description of elements of a process, and the term ‘acts’ to refer to the implementation of such steps”); *Seal-Flex*, 172 F.3d at 849-50 (Rader, J., concurring) (when a step in a method claim requires achieving a specific function but the claim fails to disclose “how the function is accomplished,” it is subject to § 112, ¶6). Plaintiffs have never disputed that claims 36, 39, 46, and 49 recite functional elements requiring that the steps in these claims accomplish specific results (i.e., creating several, specifically-defined data sets). Presumably driving their reconsideration efforts, Plaintiffs do not dispute that if these functional elements are governed by §112, ¶6, then the claims are indefinite because the specification of the ‘360 patent fails to disclose a corresponding algorithm for accomplishing the computer-implemented functions in these claims. Thus, the only question raised in Plaintiffs’ motion for reconsideration is whether §112, ¶6 applies (i.e., whether claims 36, 39, 46, and 49 sufficiently describe the “acts” for performing the recited functions, rather than merely reciting generic steps).

B. Background on Proceedings Regarding Claims 36, 39, 46, and 49.

Before issuing its claim construction order, the parties and the Court conducted extensive discovery, briefing, and oral argument on claim construction, including specifically the “step-plus-function” issues re-raised in Plaintiffs’ motion for reconsideration. The Court permitted discovery on claim construction issues, including expert discovery. (D.I. 91, 92.) Thereafter, so that the parties could thoroughly address the issues, the Court granted extensions on the page limits for *Markman* briefing, allowing both parties to submit a 35-page opening brief and a 25-page response brief. (D.I. 105.) The Court then held a four-hour *Markman* hearing, where Plaintiffs dedicated a specific portion of their argument to the “step-plus-

1 function” analysis and submitted slides on this issue to the Court for further
2 explanation. (Ex. OMR1, Hr’g Tr. 166-70.) In addition to the briefing and argument
3 focused specifically on these four method claims, the parties and the Court spent
4 considerable time on several apparatus claims that Plaintiffs agreed are governed by
5 §112, ¶6, as “means-plus-function” claims. (D.I. 103 at 18-33; D.I. 107 at 14-25; *see*
6 D.I. 106 at 21-31; D.I. 108 at 12-22; Ex. OMR1, Hr’g Tr. at 108-170.) Much of that
7 legal framework regarding §112, ¶6 applied equally to the question of whether method
8 claims 36, 39, 46, and 49 are governed by §112, ¶6.

9 Plaintiffs contended in their claim construction briefing and at the
10 *Markman* hearing (just as they reargue here) that claims 36, 39, 46, and 49 are not
11 subject to §112, ¶6 because, according to Plaintiffs, the generic steps of “processing”
12 and “analyzing” are sufficient to convey the “acts” for accomplishing the functions
13 recited in claims 36, 39, 46, and 49. (D.I. 103 at 33-35; D.I. 107 at 24-25.) Siemens
14 explained during briefing and at the *Markman* hearing why each one of Plaintiffs’
15 arguments was wrong, and why these claims are properly considered step-plus-
16 function claims. (D.I. 106 at 31-34; D.I. 108 at 22-25.)

17 In its 29-page Order, the Court relied on Federal Circuit law, including
18 Plaintiffs’ own cases, to conclude that the claims “do[] not have the requisite act,” and
19 therefore that claims 36, 39, 46, and 49 are “step-plus-function” limitations. (D.I. 114
20 at 5, 27-28.) After concluding that § 112, ¶6 governs these claims, the Court then
21 found the claims indefinite because the specification of the ‘360 patent does not
22 disclose the corresponding “acts” necessary to perform the claimed steps—i.e., the
23 patent fails to disclose the necessary algorithms for implementing the computer-
24 implemented functions recited in claims 36, 39, 46, or 49. (*Id.*)

25 **II. ARGUMENT**

26 Reconsideration is an “extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly in the
27 interests of finality and conservation of judicial resources.” *Kona Enters., Inc. v.*
28

1 *Bishop*, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000); *Carroll v. Nakatani*, 342 F.3d 934, 945
2 (9th Cir. 2003) (“[A] motion for reconsideration should not be granted, absent highly
3 unusual circumstances.”); *389 Orange Street Partners v. Arnold*, 179 F.3d 656, 665
4 (9th Cir. 1999) (similar). Plaintiffs’ motion for reconsideration falls short of this
5 rigorous standard for several reasons.

6 **A. Plaintiffs’ Motion Should Be Denied Because It Does Not Even
7 Purport to Identify Any Permissible Ground for Reconsideration
Under Local Rule 7-18.**

8 Plaintiffs’ motion is facially defective because it fails to identify—
9 indeed, it does not even argue that there exists—any permissible ground for
10 reconsideration. Local Rule 7-18 allows motions for reconsideration “*only* on the
11 grounds” of:

- 12 (a) *a material difference in fact or law* from that presented
13 to the Court before such decision that in the exercise of
14 reasonable diligence could not have been known to the party
moving for reconsideration at the time of such decision, or
- 15 (b) the emergence of *new material facts or a change of law*
occurring after the time of such decision, or
- 16 (c) a manifest showing of a *failure to consider material
facts* presented to the Court before such decision.

17 C.D. Cal. L.R. 7-18. Plaintiffs’ brief facially does not even assert, let alone
18 demonstrate, that the motion satisfies one of these three exclusive grounds for seeking
19 reconsideration. The facts and law relevant to construing claims 36, 39, 46, and 49
20 are neither different nor new compared to when the Court issued its claim construction
21 order, nor is there any fact that the Court failed to consider. Nor have Plaintiffs made
22 any assertion to the contrary.

23 In light of this facial defect in the motion, Siemens followed up with
24 Plaintiffs’ counsel after receiving their brief and asked them to “identify … what fact
25 or law Plaintiffs contend is materially different or new, or what fact Plaintiffs contend
26 the Court manifestly ignored.” (Ex. OMR2, 9/6/11 Email from McEldowney to

1 Weiss.) In response, Plaintiffs refused to identify any such fact or law, thus
2 confirming that they have no proper basis for their motion.² (Ex. OMR3, 9/7/11
3 Email from Weiss to McEldowney.) Local Rule 7-18 exists for an important reason
4 and the requirement that a party satisfy one of the three limited bases for seeking
5 reconsideration is routinely and strictly enforced in this District. *Selectron Indus., Inc.*
6 v. *Selectron Int'l*, 2007 WL 5193735, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2007) (denying
7 motion for reconsideration because motion was “improper in that it is does not appear
8 to be brought on any of the three authorized grounds for reconsideration as set forth in
9 Local Rule 7-18”); *j2 Global Commn's Inc. v. Captaris Inc.*, 2011 WL 2882792, at *1
10 (C.D. Cal. July 19, 2011) (similar); *Townsend v. Chase Bank USA, N.A.*, 2009 WL
11 764513, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 20, 2009) (similar).

12 Rather than pointing to any proper basis for reconsideration in their
13 motion, Plaintiffs simply ask the Court to “revisit” the “step-plus-function” issue
14 because Plaintiffs’ counsel believes this issue was given “short shrift.” (Ex. OMR4,
15 5/26/2011 Scheduling Conf. Tr. at 6:8-10; 15:21-24.) Not only is that not a proper
16 basis for reconsideration, it also is simply not the case.³ *See supra* section I (noting
17 claim construction was based on extensive discovery, 120 pages of briefing, and a
18 four-hour *Markman* hearing); *Activision Publ'g, Inc. v. Gibson Guitar Corp.*, 2009
19

20 ² Although Plaintiffs’ email made a conclusory reference to 7-18(c), Plaintiffs’ brief
21 (and its email) do not identify any “material fact” that the Court manifestly failed to
22 consider, as required by the local rules. Any attempt by Plaintiffs in their reply brief
23 or at the hearing to manufacture a proper basis for their motion should be stricken in
24 light of Plaintiffs’ failure in their opening brief—and their subsequent refusal when
Siemens expressly asked prior to submitting this opposition—to explain how they
contend their motion satisfies one of the categories in Local Rule 7-18.

25 ³ Plaintiffs stress that the Court stated during a telephonic status conference that it
would be “up for” reconsideration. (D.I. 128-1 at 3.) Despite Plaintiffs’ suggestion,
Siemens respectfully believes that the Court was not inviting this mere repeat of
Plaintiffs’ claim construction arguments, but instead was noting that it would be “up
for” a reconsideration motion if Plaintiffs had a proper basis and satisfied Local Rule
7-18.

1 WL 586629, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 26, 2009) (denying reconsideration of claim
2 construction order where “[t]he Court allowed the parties two rounds of briefing, held
3 a technology tutorial, and had a hearing”). Plaintiffs may be unhappy with the Court’s
4 conclusion on this issue, but that is not a proper basis, let alone the “highly unusual
5 circumstance” necessary, for reconsideration. *See, e.g., Aventis Pharms. S.A. v.*
6 *Amphastar Pharms., Inc.*, 2005 WL 5957795, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 25, 2005)
7 (disagreeing with the court’s application of the law to the facts is not a proper basis for
8 reconsideration).

9 **B. Plaintiffs’ Motion Should Be Denied Because It Repeats Arguments
10 that Plaintiffs Already Raised and the Court Correctly Rejected.**

11 Not only does Plaintiffs’ motion fail to state a proper ground for
12 reconsideration, it also flatly violates an express prohibition in Local Rule 7-18. The
13 law is crystal clear in this District—reconsideration motions that “*in any manner
14 repeat any oral or written argument* made in support of or in opposition to the
15 original motion” are forbidden and will be denied. C.D. Cal. L.R. 7-18. Not only do
16 courts in this District routinely and consistently deny reconsideration motions that
17 merely repeat previous arguments,⁴ but they often impose sanctions for filing

18 ⁴ For just a few examples, *see McCoy v. Roe*, 234 Fed. App’x 559, 560 (9th Cir. 2009)
19 (“McCoy’s motion merely restated the arguments and allegations made in support of
20 his original motion and stated no grounds for reconsideration under [] local rule [7-
21 18.”); *Activision*, 2009 WL 586629, at *3 (denying motion because it “violate[d] the
22 rule against repeating prior arguments”); *Kinetics Noise Control, Inc. v. Ecore Int’l,
23 Inc.*, 2011 WL 940335, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 14, 2011) (denying motion because
24 “Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration merely recites the argument that Plaintiff
25 made [previously]”); *A.A. v. Orange Cnty. Health Care Agency*, 2011 WL 86935, at
26 *2 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 3, 2011) (plaintiff’s “motion does nothing more than reiterate
27 arguments made in support of her original motion”); *Brown v. United States*, 2011
28 WL 333380, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 31, 2011) (similar); *Spacey v. Burgar*, 207 F. Supp.
2d 1037, 1054 (C.D. Cal. 2001); *Aventis Pharms. S.A.*, 2005 WL 5957795, at *2
([Plaintiff] does exactly what Local Rule 7-18 prohibits repeating arguments made in
its original opposition.”); *Carter v. Variflex, Inc.*, 2000 WL 35789500, at *1 (C.D.
Cal. Apr. 18, 2000) (similar); *Yang Ming Marine Transp. Corp. v. Oceanbridge
Shipping Int’l, Inc.*, 48 F. Supp. 2d 1049, 1057 (C.D. Cal. 1999) (similar).

1 reconsideration motions that fail to comply with Local Rule 7-18 and merely repeat
2 previous arguments.⁵ Plaintiffs' motion merely rehashes the very same arguments and
3 purported support (in many instances verbatim) that Plaintiffs offered during claim
4 construction. The motion should be denied on that basis alone. And even if the Court
5 were to entertain Plaintiffs' regurgitation of arguments that were already rejected,
6 which it need not do, the Court correctly rejected all of them on the merits the first
7 time around and should do so again, as explained below.

8

9 **1. The Court Correctly Rejected Plaintiffs' Fundamental
Argument that the Claim Language at Issue Sufficiently
Discloses an "Act."**

10 Plaintiffs' fundamental argument in its motion for reconsideration is the
11 very same argument they made during claim construction: that the claim limitations
12 at issue are not steps-plus-function under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶6 because, according to
13 Plaintiffs, the claim language sufficiently describes "acts" for performing the required
14 functions in claims 36, 39, 46, and 49:

15

16

17

18

19 ⁵ See, e.g., *MAI Sys. Corp. v. Walbert Enters., Inc.*, 116 F.3d 485, *15-16 (9th Cir.
20 1997) (unpublished) (affirming the award of attorneys' fees for violating Local Rule
21 7.16 (now 7.18) because plaintiffs merely "repeated arguments made in the underlying
22 motion" which "unnecessarily and unreasonably multiplied this litigation"); *Martinis v. Barbanell*, 211 F.3d 1274, *2 (9th Cir. 2000) (unpublished) (affirming sanctions:
23 "Local Rule [7.]16 [now Local Rule 7-18] provides...that '[n]o motion for
24 reconsideration shall in any manner repeat any oral or written argument made in
25 support of or in opposition to the original motion.' A review of the motions in
26 question establishes that Attorney Diaz violated this rule."); *Davidson v. City of Culver City*, 2004 WL 5361891, at *9 (C.D. Cal. 2004) (issuing "admonition" that "if
27 Plaintiffs are under the impression that this Court will indulge endless motions for
reconsideration that fail to satisfy one of the mandatory elements of Local Rule 7-
18..., Plaintiffs should reconsider"), *aff'd*, 159 Fed. App'x 756 (9th Cir. 2005); *Weber v. Gorenfeld*, 8 F.3d 34, *1-2 (9th Cir. 1993) (unpublished) (affirming sanctions that
28 were "based on violations of Rule 7.16 [now 7.18]").

1 Plaintiffs' Reconsideration Motion	Plaintiffs' <i>Markman</i> Briefs
2 Arguing that "because claim 36, 39, 3 46, and 49 recite the acts of" 4 "processing" and "analyzing," 5 "NeuroGrafix respectfully requests 6 that the Court reconsider its Claim Construction Order." (D.I. 128-1 at 2.)	Arguing that Claim 36 "recites the act of 'processing'" and Claims 39, 46, and 49 "discloses the acts of analyzing." (D.I. 103 at 34-35.)

7 The Court correctly rejected that argument and held that the limitations do "**not** have
8 the requisite act and thus [are] step-plus-function claim[s]." (D.I. 114 at 27.)

9 As Siemens explained during claim construction (D.I. 106 at 31-34; D.I.
10 108 at 22-25; Ex. OMR1, Hr'g Tr. 167-70), the claim language here is devoid of
11 anything describing **how to accomplish** the claimed functions, which is the test for
12 whether a claim should be construed as a step-plus-function claim. *Seal-Flex*, 172
13 F.3d at 849 (Rader, J., concurring) (when a step in a method claim requires achieving
14 a specific function but the claim fails to disclose "how the function is accomplished,"
15 it is subject to § 112, ¶6); *see also O.I. Corp.*, 115 F.3d at 1582-83 ("We interpret the
16 term 'steps' [in §112, ¶6] to refer to the generic description of elements of a process,
17 and the term 'acts' to refer to the implementation of such steps"); *Agere Sys. Inc. v.*
18 *Atmel Corp.*, 2003 WL 21652264, at *21-22 (E.D. Pa. May 27, 2003) (construing
19 claim as step-plus-function "because the claim does not teach how to achieve the
20 desired outcome by specifying the act"); *Caterpillar Inc. v. Detroit Diesel Corp.*, 961
21 F. Supp. 1249, 1255 (N.D. Ind. 1996) (noting §112, ¶6 "applies to functional methods
22 claims where the element at issue sets forth a step for reaching a particular result, but
23 not the specific technique or procedure used to achieve the result"), *aff'd*, 194 F.3d
24 1336 (Fed. Cir. 1999). A claim must include more than merely a generic description
25 of a step to avoid §112, ¶6—rather, it must describe how the step is implemented,
26 which claims 36, 39, 46, and 49 fail to do.

27 Specifically, step (e) in claim 36 requires achieving a specific result (i.e.,
28 "a data set describing the shape and position" of nerves). But nothing in the claim

1 describes **how** to achieve that result or gives any clue as to how to implement step (e).
2 Rather, “processing” is merely a generic description of the step. Even more egregious
3 is the “analyzing” limitation found in claims 39, 46, and 49.⁶ Those claims purport to
4 cover using multiple two-dimensional data sets to somehow generate a three-
5 dimensional representation of nerve tracts. Plaintiffs argue that the word “analyzing”
6 **by itself** is sufficient to convey the necessary “act,” i.e., how to achieve the claimed
7 3D data set. But rather than providing any act or implementation telling the reader
8 how to achieve the claimed 3D data set, the claim expressly begs that very question,
9 asking the reader to “analyze” the data set “**to determine how** to relate said data set” to
10 make a 3D data set. (‘360 patent, claims 39, 46, and 49).

11 Without any legitimate argument that the “processing” and “analyzing”
12 language alone describes how to perform the complex functions the claims purport to
13 cover, Plaintiffs resort to the legally incorrect position that the steps need not
14 “explain[] how that act must be accomplished” (D.I. 128-1 at 2), nor “describe how to
15 process the data to perform the stated function” (D.I. 128-1 at 6). But that is precisely
16 what the act must convey—i.e., “[a]cts,’ . . . correspond to how the function is
17 accomplished”—and failure to do so is precisely when §112, ¶6 applies—i.e., when “a
18 claim element recites only an underlying function without acts for performing it.”
19 *Seal-Flex*, 172 F.3d at 849-50 (Rader, J., concurring); *see also O.I. Corp.*, 115 F.3d at
20 1582-83; *Agere Sys.*, 2003 WL 21652264, at *21-22; *Caterpillar Inc.*, 961 F. Supp. at
21 1255, *aff’d*, 194 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

22 Indeed, according to Plaintiffs, the “processing” and “analyzing” steps in
23 claims 36, 39, 46, and 49 were inventive aspects of the ‘360 patent. (D.I. 107 at 2
24 (“The inventors of the ‘360 patent advanced the prior art by...linking [data] to show
25 the shape and position of nerves and neural tracts, in both two- and three-

26 ⁶ Claims 39, 46, and 49 also recite a “combining” step. Although Siemens contends
27 the step for “combining” fails to recite an act—for the same reasons as the
28 “analyzing” step—the “analyzing” step is sufficient itself to invoke §112, ¶6.

1 dimensions.”); D.I. 103 at 3 (“inventors figured out how to create three-dimensional
2 data sets representative of neural tissue”.) But the words “processing” and
3 “analyzing” are simply not sufficient in the context of these claims or the specification
4 in the ‘360 patent to describe any act suggesting how those supposed advancements
5 are accomplished. Plaintiffs instead want their claims construed (impermissibly) to
6 cover any and every conceivable way of performing the claimed functions. *Mas-
7 Hamilton Group v. LaGard, Inc.*, 156 F.3d 1206, 1214 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (a claim
8 “cannot be construed so broadly to cover every conceivable way or means to perform
9 [a] function”). The Court correctly rejected Plaintiffs’ argument during claim
10 construction, and need not revisit it now.

11 **2. The Court Was Correct During Claim Construction to Reject
12 the Points that Plaintiffs Rehash in Their Motion.**

13 Plaintiffs raised several points during claim construction purporting to
14 support their fundamental argument that the words “processing” and “analyzing” in
15 claims 36, 39, 46, and 49 sufficiently describe “acts.” Plaintiffs now raise those very
16 same points (often verbatim) in their motion for reconsideration. But they are no
17 more persuasive now than they were four months ago.

18 *First*, Plaintiffs’ motion reiterates (repeatedly) the §112, ¶6 presumption
19 that they stressed during claim construction:

20 Plaintiffs’ Reconsideration Motion	Plaintiffs’ <i>Markman</i> Briefs
21 Arguing that the Court failed to 22 appreciate that “where a claim 23 element does not use the ‘step-for’ 24 formulation, the presumption is that 25 the claim element is not a step-plus- 26 function term under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶6.” (D.I. 128-1 at 4 (citing <i>Masco Corp.</i>)).	Arguing that “where a claim term does not use the ‘step-for’ formulation, the presumption is that the claim term is not a step-plus- function term under §112, ¶6.” (D.I. 103 at 33 (citing <i>Masco Corp.</i>)).

27 The Court’s claim construction order, however, expressly acknowledged this
28 presumption, but correctly noted that it is rebuttable and that “claim elements without

1 express [step-for] language may *nevertheless* be step-plus-function claims if they
2 claim a function without a recitation of the acts for performing the function.” (D.I.
3 114 at 5 (citing *Masco Corp.* and *Seal-Flex*).) The Court then correctly applied that
4 law to conclude that “[b]ecause the claim term does not describe how to process the
5 data, it does not have the requisite act and is thus a step-plus-function claim.”⁷ (D.I.
6 114 at 27.)

7 **Second**, Plaintiffs’ reconsideration motion repeats a mischaracterization
8 of Siemens’ arguments (and the Court’s holding) in an attempt to create the very same
9 strawman argument they raised during claim construction:

10	Plaintiffs’ Reconsideration Motion	Plaintiffs’ <i>Markman</i> Briefs
11	Arguing that Siemens “argued only, 12 and the Court found, that claims 36, 13 39, 46, and 49 are subject to the step- 14 plus-function doctrine because they 15 are similar to claims 55, 58, and 61.” (D.I. 128-1 at 7 (citing <i>O.I. Corp.</i> as 16 rejecting a “parallelism” argument).)	Arguing that Siemens’ “argument is 17 premised on the fact that the 18 language used in claim 36 [is] very 19 similar as the functional language 20 used in claim 55” and that Siemens’ 21 argument is “based on the similarity 22 in language between [claims 39, 46, 23 and 49] and the means-plus-function 24 language in claims 58 and 61.” (D.I. 25 103 at 34-35 (citing <i>O.I. Corp.</i>)).

26 But this was never Siemens’ argument, nor was it the basis of the Court’s claim
27 construction order. (Ex. OMR1, Hr’g Tr. 168:19-22; *see* D.I. 108 at 23 (the parallel
28 language in the apparatus and method claims “has never been Siemens’ argument” for
why the method claims are subject to §112, ¶6).) Indeed, at the claim construction
hearing Siemens’ counsel explained: “I’m not suggesting, Your Honor, that there’s a

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
5510
5511
5512
5513
5514
5515
5516
5517
5518
5519
5520
5521
5522
5523
5524
5525
5526
5527
5528
5529
5530
5531
5532
5533
5534
5535
5536
5537
5538
5539
5540
5541
5542
5543
5544
5545
5546
5547
5548
5549
5550
5551
5552
5553
5554
5555
5556
5557
5558
5559
5560
5561
5562
5563
5564
5565
5566
5567
5568
5569
55610
55611
55612
55613
55614
55615
55616
55617
55618
55619
55620
55621
55622
55623
55624
55625
55626
55627
55628
55629
55630
55631
55632
55633
55634
55635
55636
55637
55638
55639
55640
55641
55642
55643
55644
55645
55646
55647
55648
55649
55650
55651
55652
55653
55654
55655
55656
55657
55658
55659
55660
55661
55662
55663
55664
55665
55666
55667
55668
55669
55670
55671
55672
55673
55674
55675
55676
55677
55678
55679
55680
55681
55682
55683
55684
55685
55686
55687
55688
55689
55690
55691
55692
55693
55694
55695
55696
55697
55698
55699
556100
556101
556102
556103
556104
556105
556106
556107
556108
556109
556110
556111
556112
556113
556114
556115
556116
556117
556118
556119
556120
556121
556122
556123
556124
556125
556126
556127
556128
556129
556130
556131
556132
556133
556134
556135
556136
556137
556138
556139
556140
556141
556142
556143
556144
556145
556146
556147
556148
556149
556150
556151
556152
556153
556154
556155
556156
556157
556158
556159
556160
556161
556162
556163
556164
556165
556166
556167
556168
556169
556170
556171
556172
556173
556174
556175
556176
556177
556178
556179
556180
556181
556182
556183
556184
556185
556186
556187
556188
556189
556190
556191
556192
556193
556194
556195
556196
556197
556198
556199
556200
556201
556202
556203
556204
556205
556206
556207
556208
556209
556210
556211
556212
556213
556214
556215
556216
556217
556218
556219
556220
556221
556222
556223
556224
556225
556226
556227
556228
556229
556230
556231
556232
556233
556234
556235
556236
556237
556238
556239
556240
556241
556242
556243
556244
556245
556246
556247
556248
556249
556250
556251
556252
556253
556254
556255
556256
556257
556258
556259
556260
556261
556262
556263
556264
556265
556266
556267
556268
556269
556270
556271
556272
556273
556274
556275
556276
556277
556278
556279
556280
556281
556282
556283
556284
556285
556286
556287
556288
556289
556290
556291
556292
556293
556294
556295
556296
556297
556298
556299
556300
556301
556302
556303
556304
556305
556306
556307
556308
556309
556310
556311
556312
556313
556314
556315
556316
556317
556318
556319
556320
556321
556322
556323
556324
556325
556326
556327
556328
556329
556330
556331
556332
556333
556334
556335
556336
556337
556338
556339
556340
556341
556342
556343
556344
556345
556346
556347
556348
556349
556350
556351
556352
556353
556354
556355
556356
556357
556358
556359
556360
556361
556362
556363
556364
556365
556366
556367
556368
556369
556370
556371
556372
556373
556374
556375
556376
556377
556378
556379
556380
556381
556382
556383
556384
556385
556386
556387
556388
556389
556390
556391
556392
556393
556394
556395
556396
556397
556398
556399
556400
556401
556402
556403
556404
556405
556406
556407
556408
556409
556410
556411
556412
556413
556414
556415
556416
556417
556418
556419
556420
556421
556422
556423
556424
556425
556426
556427
556428
556429
556430
556431
556432
556433
556434
556435
556436
556437
556438
556439
556440
556441
556442
556443
556444
556445
556446
556447
556448
556449
556450
556451
556452
556453
556454
556455
556456
556457
556458
556459
556460
556461
556462
556463
556464
556465
556466
556467
556468
556469
556470
556471
556472
556473
556474
556475
556476
556477
556478
556479
556480
556481
556482
556483
556484
556485
556486
556487
556488
556489
556490
556491
556492
556493
556494
556495
556496
556497
556498
556499
556500
556501
556502
556503
556504
556505
556506
556507
556508
556509
556510
556511
556512
556513
556514
556515
556516
556517
556518
556519
556520
556521
556522
556523
556524
556525
556526
556527
556528
556529
556530
556531
556532
556533
556534
556535
556536
556537
556538
556539
556540
556541
556542
556543
556544
556545
556546
556547
556548
556549
556550
556551
556552
556553
556554
556555
556556
556557
556558
556559
556560
556561
556562
556563
556564
556565
556566
556567
556568
556569
556570
556571
556572
556573
556574
556575
556576
556577
556578
556579
556580
556581
556582
556583
556584
556585
556586
556587
556588
556589
556590
556591
556592
556593
556594
556595
556596
556597
556598
556599
556600
556601
556602
556603
556604
556605
556606
556607
556608
556609
556610
556611
556612
556613
556614
556615
556616
556617
556618
556619
556620
556621
556622
556623
556624
556625
556626
556627
556628
556629
556630
556631
556632
556633
556634
556635
556636
556637
556638
556639
556640
556641
556642
556643
556644
556645
556646
556647
556648
556649
556650
556651
556652
556653
556654
556655
556656
556657
556658
556659
556660
556661
556662
556663
556664
556665
556666
556667
556668
556669
556670
556671
556672
556673
556674
556675
556676
556677
556678
556679
556680
556681
556682
556683
556684
556685
556686
556687
556688
556689
556690
556691
556692
556693
556694
556695
556696
556697
556698
556699
556700
556701
556702
556703
556704
556705
556706
556707
556708
556709
556710
556711
556712
556713
556714
556715
556716
556717
556718
556719
556720
556721
556722
556723
556724
556725
556726
556727
556728
556729
556730
556731
556732
556733
556734
556735
556736
556737
556738
556739
556740
556741
556742
556743
556744
556745
556746
556747
556748
556749
556750
556751
556752
556753
556754
556755
556756
556757
556758
556759
556760
556761
556762
556763
556764
556765
556766
556767
556768
556769
556770
556771
556772
556773
556774
556775
556776
556777
556778
556779
556780
556781
556782
556783
556784
556785
556786
556787
556788
556789
556790
556791
556792
556793
556794
556795
556796
556797
556798
556799
556800
556801
556802
556803
556804
556805
556806
556807
556808
556809
556810
556811
556812
556813
556814
556815
556816
556817
556818
556819
556820
556821
556822
556823
556824
556825
556826
556827
556828
556829
556830
556831
556832
556833
556834
556835
556836
556837
556838
556839
556840
556841
556842
556843
556844
556845
556846
556847
556848
556849
556850
556851
556852
556853
556854
556855
556856
556857
556858
556859
556860
556861
556862
556863
556864
556865
556866
556867
556868
556869
556870
556871
556872
556873
556874
556875
556876
556877
556878
556879
556880
556881
556882
556883
556884
556885
556886
556887
556888
556889
556890
556891
556892
556893
556894
556895
556896
556897
556898
556899
556900
556901
556902
556903
556904
556905
556906
556907
556908
556909
556910
556911
556912
556913
556914
556915
556916
556917
556918
556919
556920
556921
556922
556923
556924
556925
556926
556927
556928
556929
556930
556931
556932
556933
556934
556935
556936
556937
556938
556939
556940
556941
556942
556943
556944
5569

1 presumption that if you have it both as an apparatus and as a method that you
2 automatically turn all those methods into step-plus-function.” (Ex. OMR1, Hr’g Tr.
3 168:19-22.) Rather, as Siemens has always maintained, these claims are subject to
4 step-plus-function analysis (independent of the apparatus claims) because the claim
5 language does not “tell you any act to perform.” (See, e.g. D.I. 108 at 23; Ex. OMR1,
6 Hr’g. Tr. at 168:23-25 (“But what I am saying is when you have language like this
7 that doesn’t tell you any act to perform in the claim to do it.”).) The Court based its
8 decision on this correct rationale. (D.I. 114 at 27, 28.)

9 **Third**, Plaintiffs reargue their view that Siemens (and the Court) treated
10 the claims inconsistently:

11 Plaintiffs’ Reconsideration Motion	12 Plaintiffs’ <i>Markman</i> Briefs
13 Arguing that the Court’s 14 construction of claims 36, 39, 46, 15 and 49 as “step-plus-function” 16 limitations” is “inconsistent because 17 other claims recite the same” sort of 18 “processing” step, and those claims (i.e., claims 1-35) were not held to be step-plus-function claims. (D.I. 128-1 at 7-8.)	19 Arguing that Siemens’ “argument is 20 also inconsistent” because Siemens 21 did not argue that the “processing” 22 steps in claims 1-35 were step-plus- 23 function. (D.I. 107 at 24.)

24 But Siemens never asked the Court to construe the limitations in claims 1-35 as “step-
25 plus-function” limitations, because Siemens contended (and still contends) that the
26 phrase “conspicuity of 1.1” in step (d) of claims 1-35 renders those claims indefinite,
27 without having to reach the question of whether §112, ¶6 applies to those claims.
(D.I. 106 at 8-17; D.I. 108 at 2-9.) The fact that the patent also fails to disclose how to
achieve the claimed result in step (d) of claims 1-35 (i.e., the “processing” step in
those claims) is simply a further reason those claims are invalid. Moreover, while
Plaintiffs also point to claim limitation 36(d) as a “processing” limitation that was
supposedly treated “inconsistently,” claim limitation 36(d) recites “vector processing”

1 and not merely “processing,” which is a limitation that was separately addressed by
2 the parties and construed by the Court. (D.I. 114 at 28; *see also* D.I. 106 at 35 n.17.)⁸

3 **Fourth**, Plaintiffs repeat their argument—which still lacks any applicable
4 legal support and fails to address the specific context of the claims at issue—that
5 “processing” is “routinely” found to be a sufficient “act”:⁹

6 Plaintiffs’ Reconsideration Motion	7 Plaintiffs’ <i>Markman</i> Briefs
8 Arguing that the Court erred 9 “because [the] claims contain language” (i.e., “processing” and “analyzing”) “that are routinely 10 construed as acts by courts.” (D.I. 11 128-1 at 4.)	12 Arguing that “courts routinely 13 construe processing steps without 14 resorting to §112, ¶6.” (D.I. 107 at 24.)

15 As Siemens pointed out during claim construction, none of the cases Plaintiffs cited
16 during claim construction for this proposition even considered the question of whether
17 the “processing” step in those patents should be construed as step-plus-function

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

⁸ Contrary to Plaintiffs’ argument, Siemens did ask the Court to construe the “processing” step in claim 51(d) as subject to § 112, ¶6. (D.I. 108 at 24 n.34 (“method claim 63 (**and claims 51** and 52 from which it depends per the Certificate of Correction) should be construed as step-plus-function claims....”)). Per the Certificate of Corrections attached to the end of the ‘360 patent, asserted method claim 63 depends from unasserted method claims 52 and 51. (*Id.*) While the Court correctly determined when to apply § 112, ¶6 to the “processing” steps in claim 36, it omitted claim 63 from its claim construction order. The “processing” step in claim 51 (which is incorporated into the asserted dependent claim 63) should be construed as subject to §112, ¶6, as explained in Siemens’ claim construction briefing (D.I. 108 at 24 n.34), for all the same reasons that the “processing” step in element 36(e) is subject to §112, ¶6.

⁹ Plaintiffs also contend that the “plain meaning of ‘processing’ defines the act,” because the dictionary definition of “processing” is “put[ting] through the steps of a prescribed procedure.” (D.I. 128-1 at 6.) That definition was discussed and quoted during claim construction. (D.I. 108 at 24.) In these claims and in the specification of the ‘360 patent, the “procedure” is not “prescribed,” and so the dictionary definition only highlights that “processing” by itself does not disclose how the function is accomplished or implemented.

1 elements. (D.I. 108 at 24 n.32; *see* cases cited D.I. 107 at 24, ll.17-22.) And Plaintiffs
2 cite no further support for this proposition in their motion for reconsideration. The
3 Court correctly found that the “processing” and “analyzing” limitations here do not
4 constitute acts.¹⁰ (D.I. 114 at 27-28.)

5 **Fifth**, Plaintiffs fail to raise any new case law that in any way alters the
6 Court’s analysis of claims 36, 39, 46, and 49. Instead, Plaintiffs reconsideration
7 motion focuses on the very same passages from the very same cases that were the
8 focus of their arguments during claim construction that the Court considered and
9 rejected:¹¹

10 Plaintiffs’ Reconsideration Motion	11 Plaintiffs’ <i>Markman</i> Briefs
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 Discussing <i>Masco Corp.</i> and noting that in <i>Cardiac Pacemakers</i> “the Federal Circuit reversed the lower court” holding that the claim language “determining a condition of the heart from among a plurality of conditions of the heart” was subject to §112, ¶6. (D.I. 128-1 at 5.)	Discussing <i>Masco Corp.</i> and noting that in <i>Cardiac Pacemakers</i> “the Federal Circuit has overturned a district court for holding” that the claim language “determining a condition of the heart from among a plurality of conditions of the heart” was subject to §112, ¶6. (D.I. 103 at 34.)

18 In *Masco Corp.* and *Cardiac Pacemakers*, §112, ¶6 did not apply because the precise
19 “act” was readily apparent from the claim language itself, and also because “the
20 invention [was] not based on how” the step was performed and the act was, moreover,
21 described in the specification. *See Masco Corp.*, 202 F.3d at 1328; *Cardiac*

22
23
24
25
26
27
28
¹⁰ Plaintiffs contend that using “**any verb**” in a claim is sufficient to constitute an
“act.” (D.I. 128-1 at 2). That would completely eviscerate any application of §112,
¶6 to method claims, because method claims, virtually by definition, include a verb.

¹¹ Plaintiffs’ attempt (D.I. 128-1, at 7) to distinguish *Agere Systems*, a case that was
cited and discussed during claim construction, is unavailing. (D.I. 106 at 32-33; D.I.
108 at 22-24). The holding in *Agere Systems* was that “the claim language...falls
within § 112, ¶6 because it recites a step...for performing a specified
function...without reciting the acts necessary to perform this step and achieve this
function.” 2003 WL 21652264, at *22. That is exactly why §112, ¶6 applies here.

1 *Pacemakers, Inc., v. St. Jude Med., Inc.*, 381 F.3d 1371, 1382 (Fed. Cir. 2004). Here,
2 in contrast, the supposed invention of the ‘360 patent is based on the complex
3 “processing” and “analyzing” steps undisputedly performed by a computer. But how
4 to accomplish those steps with a computer is neither readily apparent from the claim
5 language itself nor even described in the specification.¹² *In re Cohn*, 438 F.2d 989,
6 999 (C.C.P.A. 1971) (looking to the specification to define a method step where the
7 claim “expresses performing particular steps until a given result or state is reached”
8 and then finding the claim indefinite); *Inventio AG v. Thyssenkrupp Elevator Ams.*
9 *Corp.*, 2011 WL 2342744, *6 (Fed. Cir. June 15, 2011) (courts should consider “the
10 written description, prosecution history, and extrinsic evidence to determine if” §112,
11 ¶6 applies).

12 * * * *

13 Simply put, each one of Plaintiffs’ arguments is a repeat of an argument
14 that was made and rejected during claim construction. That is precisely what the
15 Local Rules expressly forbid parties from doing in a reconsideration motion. This
16 Court need not and should not redo claim construction simply because Plaintiffs are
17 unhappy with the outcome. And in any event, the Court correctly rejected all of these
18 arguments during claim construction based on its review of the ‘360 patent, §112, ¶6
19 itself, and case law interpreting that statute. The law still dictates the same
20 conclusion, on the same grounds the Court already found.

21 **III. CONCLUSION**

22 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should deny Plaintiffs’ motion for
23 reconsideration and grant Siemens’ Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity of

24
25 ¹² For similar reasons, the other cases cited by Plaintiffs are also inapposite. See
26 *Advanced Med. Optics, Inc. v. Alcon Inc.*, 361 F. Supp. 2d 370, 398 (D. Del. 2005)
27 (simple non-computer-implemented steps of “engaging” and “holding” by themselves
denoted sufficient structures); *Synopsys, Inc v. Magma Design Automation, Inc.*, 2005
WL 6227071, at *6 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 23, 2005) (sufficient description in the
specification).

1 Claims 36, 39, 46, and 49, which Plaintiffs oppose exclusively on the basis of their
2 motion for reconsideration. (D.I. 140 at 9-10.)
3
4
5
6

7 DATED: September 12,
8 2011

9 By: /s/ Sean M. McEldowney
10 Gregg F. LoCascio, P.C. (*pro hac vice*)
gregg.locascio@kirkland.com
11 Sean M. McEldowney (S.B.N. 248368)
sean.mceldowney@kirkland.com
Christopher R. Nalevanko (*pro hac vice*)
christopher.nalevanko@kirkland.com
12 Brian N. Gross (*pro hac vice*)
brian.gross@kirkland.com
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
13 655 15th St. N.W.
Suite 1200
14 Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 879-5000
Facsimile: (202) 879-5200

15 Luke L. Dauchot (S.B.N. 229829)
16 luke.dauchot@kirkland.com
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
17 333 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 680-8400
Facsimile: (213) 680-8500

18
19 Attorneys for Defendant

20 SIEMENS MEDICAL SOLUTIONS USA, INC.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on September 12, 2011, a copy of the foregoing
MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION OF THE COURT'S CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER was
served upon counsel of record for Plaintiffs registered with the Court's CM/ECF
system.

/s/Sean M. McEldowney